

REMARKS

All amendments are made without prejudice. Claims 7 and 26 are cancelled, their subject matter having been brought into claim 1. Claims 3, 8, 9, 12-22 and 28 are withdrawn.

Claims 44 and 45 are new. We comment as follows where appropriate by reference to the sub-headings used in the action.

Election/Restriction

The claims now before the Examiner include the elected species of adhesion promoter (low molecular weight amines) and other species of adhesion promoter and the elected species of solvent (ester based solvents) and other species of solvent. Accordingly we submit that these claims are consistent with the species elections previously made.

We hereby request to be permitted to re-introduce the withdrawn subject matter in the event that the claims filed herewith are allowed given that these claims are generic to the withdrawn subject matter.

Claim Objections

We have corrected the typographical error in the term “PE1” to “PEI” in the language of claim 7 which now appears in amended claim 1.

We have also corrected the typographical error in the word “ethoxyethylacetate” in claim 28.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

We have amended claims 34-36 to delete the objected to language “and additive”.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102 and 103

We respectfully submit that these rejections have been overcome by amendment. We have limited each of the independent claims such that the amino silane adhesion promoter is excluded.

The Examiner has relied on the reference US 5,212,017 of Meder to substantiate his 35 USC 102 rejection. In addition this reference has been cited as the primary reference to substantiate the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection.

Meder discloses the use of a priming formulation comprising an aprotic solvent having a specific solubility parameter (amide based solvent is used in the examples) together with an aminosilane adhesion promoter. While the substrate used in the examples is a polyimide film, column 11, line 22 indicates that a laminate (coated substrate) can also be primed using this formulation.

We have amended claim 1 to further define the adhesion promoter as being selected from the Group specifically listed in claim 7 with the exception of aminosilane. We have also further defined the organic solvent by incorporating the subject matter of claim 26 into claim 1. These actions have necessitated deletion of claims 7 and 26 and amendment of claim 22 to remove the reference to other aminosilanes.

The Examiner makes reference to Meder disclosing alcohol solvents (column 12, lines 63-68). As described in this passage of Meder and in the table following, isopropanol only works if the substrate is abraded or etched. The present method requires no prior 'priming' of the surface.

In light of the above we respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections are overcome by amendment. Meder neither discloses, teaches or suggests the method of activating an organic coating as recited in the amended independent claims herein.

Furthermore the Examiner has rejected claim 10 as being unpatentable over Meder and further in view of Fey (US 5,248,334). The Examiner states that Fey is cited for its teaching of other adhesion promoting compounds including organic amine compounds such as ethylenediamine and triethylenetetraamine (col. 4 lines 3-9).

However we respectfully submit that none of the claims are obvious based on the disclosure of Meder in view of Fey. The disclosure of Fey relates to a composition and a method for priming and coating a cured silicone substrate. The primer composition of Fey consists essentially of a primer component and a solvent component and the primer component consists essentially of an aminoalkyl- substituted trialkoxysilane, a carboxylic acid salt of tin and *optionally* (emphasis added) an organic amine compound selected from the group consisting of alkanolamines and polyamines. As such the subject invention as now claimed is not obvious based on Meder in view of Fey.

Allowance of the subject application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via electronic filing.

February 28, 2011

(Date of Transmission)

Lonnie Louie

(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Lonnie Louie/

(Signature)

Respectfully submitted,

/Mavis S. Gallenson/

Mavis S. Gallenson

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 32,464

LADAS & PARRY LLP

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300